



Intervention Outcomes

State Fiscal Year 2010

Presented January 2011

Table of Contents

Past Intervention Topic Selections	3
Sedative Hypnotics	
Criteria Summary Case Outcome	4
Case Response Totals	4
Prescriber Evaluation Totals	5
Cycle Comparison	5
Estimated Cost Savings Summary	6
Atypical Antipsychotic Duplication	
Criteria Summary Case Outcome	7
Case Response Totals	7
Prescriber Evaluation Totals	8
Cycle Comparison	8
Estimated Cost Savings Summary	9
Muscle Relaxants	
Criteria Summary Case Outcome	10
Case Response Totals	10
Prescriber Evaluation Totals	11
Cycle Comparison	11
Estimated Cost Savings Summary	12
Diabetes	
Criteria Summary Case Outcome	13
Case Response Totals	14
Prescriber Evaluation Totals	14
Cycle Comparison	15
Estimated Cost Savings Summary	16
Dyslipidemia	
Criteria Summary Case Outcome	17
Case Response Totals	17
Prescriber Evaluation Totals	18
Estimated Cost Savings Summary	19

Past Intervention Topic Selections

SFY 2005
Diabetes
Dose Consolidation
Psychotropics in Kids
Reducing Risk of Falls in the Elderly
Hyperlipidemia

SFY 2006
Medication Adherence
NSAID
Short and Long Acting Opiates
Gabapentin
Hypertension

SFY 2007
Asthma
Hormone Replacement Therapy
Migraine
Diabetes
Hyperlipidemia

SFY 2008
Diabetes
Chronic Heart Failure
GI
Osteoporosis
Hypertension

SFY 2009
Anticonvulsants
Cardiovascular Disease in Women
Asthma
NSAIDS & COX-2
Narcotic Usage

SFY 2010
Sedative Hypnotics
Muscle Relaxants
Atypical Antipsychotic Duplication
Dyslipidemia
Diabetes

SFY 2011
Increased Risk of Serotonin Syndrome
Appropriate ADD/ADHD Treatment
Psychotropics in Kids
Appropriate Narcotic Utilization
History of Drug Abuse

November 2009 Intervention Sedative Hypnotics

Criteria Summary Case Outcomes

Criteria Number	Therapeutic Criteria Exceptions Reviewed	Cases Generated	Letters Generated	Letters Mailed
88	25	5	6	6
165	182	144	144	131
167	793	410	626	551
172	3	1	1	0
280	35	7	7	6
310	181	47	47	46
312	70	2	2	1
520	10	3	5	5
564	71	57	57	51
567	105	5	5	5
587	18	11	11	8
688	19	1	1	1
809	18	2	2	2
2181	2	1	1	1
Totals	1,532	696	915	814

Case Response Totals

Prescriber Response	Count
Benefits of the drug outweigh the risks	15
MD unaware of what other MD prescribing	13
Pt is no longer under this MD's care	17
MD says problem is insignificant, no therapy change	143
MD will reassess and modify drug therapy	13
MD tried to modify therapy, Pt non-cooperative	14
Pt under my care but not seen recently	12
Patient deceased	1
Patient was never under MD care	6
Has appointment to discuss therapy	26
MD did not write prescription attributed to him	26
Tried to modify therapy, symptoms reoccurred	8
MD saw patient only once in ER or as on-call MD	8
MD response form returned blank	36

Totals **338**

Prescriber Response Rate: 41.5%

November 2009 Intervention Sedative Hypnotics

Prescriber Evaluation Totals

Prescriber Evaluation	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Total Letters Mailed
Not useful	30	11.7%	3.7%
Somewhat useful	21	8.2%	2.6%
Neutral	61	23.8%	7.5%
Useful	85	33.2%	10.4%
Extremely useful	59	23.0%	7.2%

Total Responses **256** **31.4%**

Total Letters Mailed **814**

Cycle Comparison

Criteria Number	Unique Beneficiaries Received Letters	Unique Beneficiaries Intersecting with December 2010 ICER	Percent of Beneficiaries with Therapy Changes
88	5	3	40.0%
165	131	58	55.7%
167	382	120	68.6%
280	6	2	66.7%
310	46	24	47.8%
312	1	0	100.0%
520	3	1	66.7%
564	51	20	60.8%
567	5	3	40.0%
587	8	6	25.0%
688	1	1	0.0%
809	2	0	100.0%
2181	1	0	100.0%

Totals **642** **238** **62.9%**

November 2009 Intervention Sedative Hypnotics

Estimated Cost Savings Summary

REPORT PARAMETERS

Pre-Intervention time period: 180
 Post-Intervention time period: 180
 Null period: 14
 Intervention Date: 11/16/2009

SUMMARY OF CASE INFORMATION

Total Number of Cases Generated: 696
 Total Number of Deleted Cases: 54
 Total Number of Letters Sent: 814
 Total Number of Completed Cases: 642
 Total Number of Unique Patients: 696
 Total Number of Patients with Completed Cases: 642
 Total Number of Patients Available for Analysis: 642

PATIENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

	# of Beneficiaries	Pre Intervention	Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Group 1	615	\$1,224,731	\$1,146,854	\$77,876	6.4%
Group 2	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Group 3	27	\$44,506	\$0	\$44,506	100%
Group 4	54	\$107,839	\$87,346	\$20,493	19%
Group 5	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
		Comparison Pre Intervention	Comparison Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Comparison Group 1		\$1,519,705	\$1,443,556	\$76,149	5%

Estimated Cost Savings: \$1,727

KEY TO PATIENT ANALYSIS GROUPS

Group 1 – Patients with completed cases, data is available for both pre & post intervention timeframes.

Group 2 – Incomplete cases

Group 3 – Patients with complete cases but no data available for the post intervention timeframe, patient deceased or lost eligibility after letters were mailed.

Group 4 – Patients with letters deleted during the quality analysis.

Group 5 – Patients with completed cases where there would be an expected cost increase post-intervention.

**January 2010 Intervention
Atypical Antipsychotic Duplication**

Criteria Summary Case Outcomes

Criteria Number	Therapeutic Criteria Exceptions Reviewed	Cases Generated	Letters Generated	Letters Mailed
99	245	3	3	3
454	1,000	405	584	575
561	642	2	3	3
1258	25	2	2	2
1260	16	1	1	1
2937	2	2	2	2
3087	21	2	2	2
3168	202	33	42	39
3169	81	4	5	5
3170	56	1	1	1
3178	418	4	4	4
3229	15	6	6	6
3231	41	19	23	23
3232	80	56	56	55
3233	3	3	3	3
3308	38	12	13	13
Totals	2,885	555	750	737

Case Response Totals

Prescriber Response	Count
Benefits of the drug outweigh the risks	7
MD unaware of what other MD prescribing	4
Pt is no longer under this MD's care	44
MD says problem is insignificant, no therapy change	67
MD will reassess and modify drug therapy	8
MD tried to modify therapy, Pt non-cooperative	4
Pt under my care but not seen recently	2
Patient was never under MD care	10
Has appointment to discuss therapy	13
MD did not write prescription attributed to him	13
Tried to modify therapy, symptoms reoccurred	12
MD saw patient only once in ER or as on-call MD	15
MD response form returned blank	30
Totals	229

Prescriber Response Rate: 31.1%

**January 2010 Intervention
Atypical Antipsychotic Duplication**

Prescriber Evaluation Totals

Prescriber Evaluation	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Total Letters Mailed
Not useful	32	19.8%	4.3%
Somewhat useful	17	10.5%	2.3%
Neutral	27	16.7%	3.7%
Useful	54	33.3%	7.3%
Extremely useful	32	19.8%	4.3%

Total Responses **162** **22.0%**

Total Letters Mailed **737**

Cycle Comparison

Criteria Number	Unique Beneficiaries Received Letters	Unique Beneficiaries Intersecting with December 2010 ICER	Percent of Beneficiaries with Therapy Changes
99	3	2	33.3%
454	403	199	50.6%
561	2	1	50.0%
1258	2	1	50.0%
1260	1	0	100.0%
2937	2	0	100.0%
3087	2	0	100.0%
3168	30	22	26.7%
3169	4	1	75.0%
3170	1	0	100.0%
3178	4	4	0.0%
3229	6	2	66.7%
3231	19	11	42.1%
3232	55	31	43.6%
3233	3	1	66.7%
3308	12	7	41.7%
Totals	549	282	48.6%

**January 2010 Intervention
Atypical Antipsychotic Duplication**

Estimated Cost Savings Summary**REPORT PARAMETERS**

Pre-Intervention time period: 180
 Post-Intervention time period: 180
 Null period: 14
 Intervention Date: 1/18/2010

SUMMARY OF CASE INFORMATION

Total Number of Cases Generated: 555
 Total Number of Deleted Cases: 6
 Total Number of Letters Sent: 737
 Total Number of Completed Cases: 549
 Total Number of Unique Patients: 555
 Total Number of Patients with Completed Cases: 549
 Total Number of Patients Available for Analysis: 549

PATIENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

	# of Beneficiaries	Pre Intervention	Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Group 1	532	\$3,307,110	\$3,065,860	\$241,250	7.3%
Group 2	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Group 3	17	\$88,336	\$0	\$88,336	100%
Group 4	6	\$36,852	\$42,692	(\$5,841)	-15.8%
Group 5	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	

	Comparison Pre Intervention	Comparison Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Comparison Group 1	\$2,625,452	\$2,508,600	\$116,852	4.5%

Estimated Cost Savings: \$124,398

KEY TO PATIENT ANALYSIS GROUPS

Group 1 – Patients with completed cases, data is available for both pre & post intervention timeframes.

Group 2 – Incomplete cases

Group 3 – Patients with complete cases but no data available for the post intervention timeframe, patient deceased or lost eligibility after letters were mailed.

Group 4 – Patients with letters deleted during the quality analysis.

Group 5 – Patients with completed cases where there would be an expected cost increase post-intervention.

March 2010 Intervention Muscle Relaxants

Criteria Summary Case Outcomes

Criteria Number	Therapeutic Criteria Exceptions Reviewed	Cases Generated	Letters Generated	Letters Mailed
305	58	55	55	50
620	134	125	168	147
664	175	115	115	102
665	2	2	4	4
666	2	1	1	1
667	116	10	12	11
816	75	6	8	8
1117	122	109	147	124
1119	61	4	4	4
1120	19	18	18	17
1121	22	10	10	9
1122	2	2	2	2
1123	7	6	6	4
1135	18	2	4	4
1858	26	4	4	4
1926	2	1	1	1
2415	14	7	13	12
2791	11	6	6	6
Totals	866	483	578	510

Case Response Totals

Prescriber Response	Count
Benefits of the drug outweigh the risks	8
MD unaware of what other MD prescribing	5
Pt is no longer under this MD's care	11
MD says problem is insignificant, no therapy change	75
MD will reassess and modify drug therapy	26
MD tried to modify therapy, Pt non-cooperative	11
Pt under my care but not seen recently	8
Patient was never under MD care	1
Has appointment to discuss therapy	22
MD did not write prescription attributed to him	9
Tried to modify therapy, symptoms reoccurred	4
MD saw patient only once in ER or as on-call MD	8
MD response form returned blank	16
Totals	204

Prescriber Response Rate: 40%

March 2010 Intervention Muscle Relaxants

Prescriber Evaluation Totals

Prescriber Evaluation	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Total Letters Mailed
Not useful	18	10.4%	3.5%
Somewhat useful	12	6.9%	2.4%
Neutral	41	23.7%	8.0%
Useful	72	41.6%	14.1%
Extremely useful	30	17.3%	5.9%

Total Responses **173** **33.9%**

Total Letters Mailed **510**

Cycle Comparison

Criteria Number	Unique Beneficiaries Received Letters	Unique Beneficiaries Intersecting with December 2010 ICER	Percent of Beneficiaries with Therapy Changes
305	50	27	46.0%
620	115	36	68.7%
664	102	0	100.0%
665	2	0	100.0%
666	1	0	100.0%
667	9	2	77.8%
816	6	0	100.0%
1117	96	30	68.8%
1119	4	1	75.0%
1120	17	5	70.6%
1121	9	3	66.7%
1122	2	1	50.0%
1123	4	0	100.0%
1135	2	0	100.0%
1858	4	1	75.0%
1926	1	0	100.0%
2415	7	2	71.4%
2791	6	2	66.7%

Totals **437** **110** **74.8%**

March 2010 Intervention Muscle Relaxants

Estimated Cost Savings Summary

REPORT PARAMETERS

Pre-Intervention time period: 180
 Post-Intervention time period: 180
 Null period: 14
 Intervention Date: 3/8/2010

SUMMARY OF CASE INFORMATION

Total Number of Cases Generated: 483
 Total Number of Deleted Cases: 46
 Total Number of Letters Sent: 510
 Total Number of Completed Cases: 437
 Total Number of Unique Patients: 482
 Total Number of Patients with Completed Cases: 436
 Total Number of Patients Available for Analysis: 436

PATIENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

	# of Beneficiaries	Pre Intervention	Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Group 1	418	\$1,576,960	\$1,559,607	\$17,353	1.1%
Group 2	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Group 3	18	\$64,101	\$0	\$64,101	100%
Group 4	46	\$192,496	\$190,535	\$1,961	1%
Group 5	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	

	Comparison Pre Intervention	Comparison Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Comparison Group 1	\$1,561,803	\$1,607,324	(\$45,521)	-2.9%

Estimated Cost Savings: \$62,874

KEY TO PATIENT ANALYSIS GROUPS

Group 1 – Patients with completed cases, data is available for both pre & post intervention timeframes.

Group 2 – Incomplete cases

Group 3 – Patients with complete cases but no data available for the post intervention timeframe, patient deceased or lost eligibility after letters were mailed.

Group 4 – Patients with letters deleted during the quality analysis.

Group 5 – Patients with completed cases where there would be an expected cost increase post-intervention.

**April 2010 Intervention
Diabetes**

Criteria Summary Case Outcomes

Criteria Number	Therapeutic Criteria Exceptions Reviewed	Cases Generated	Letters Generated	Letters Mailed
41	120	66	85	64
450	74	72	72	55
488	170	132	157	131
622	13	5	7	5
635	19	10	14	11
1040	6	3	3	3
1045	24	7	7	7
1047	4	1	1	1
1053	39	13	15	14
1054	201	135	135	114
1056	13	6	6	6
1060	27	19	23	21
1143	5	1	1	1
1145	6	2	3	2
1308	82	60	60	50
1602	22	20	20	17
1674	40	7	11	8
2356	4	3	3	3
2573	77	70	73	61
2934	42	39	39	37
2947	1	1	1	1
3045	5	4	4	4
3047	2	1	1	1
3048	3	2	2	2
3150	1	1	1	1
3224	14	13	13	13
Totals	1,014	693	757	633

April 2010 Intervention Diabetes

Case Response Totals

Prescriber Response	Count
Benefits of the drug outweigh the risks	22
MD unaware of what other MD prescribing	1
Pt is no longer under this MD's care	6
MD says problem is insignificant, no therapy change	85
MD will reassess and modify drug therapy	16
MD tried to modify therapy, Pt non-cooperative	1
Pt under my care but not seen recently	8
Patient deceased	2
Patient was never under MD care	2
Has appointment to discuss therapy	21
MD did not write prescription attributed to him	12
Tried to modify therapy, symptoms reoccurred	1
MD saw patient only once in ER or as on-call MD	2
MD response form returned blank	31

Totals **210**

Prescriber Response Rate: 33.2%

Prescriber Evaluation Totals

Prescriber Evaluation	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Total Letters Mailed
Not useful	28	18.7%	4.4%
Somewhat useful	25	16.7%	3.9%
Neutral	26	17.3%	4.1%
Useful	53	35.3%	8.4%
Extremely useful	18	12.0%	2.8%

Total Responses **150** **23.7%**

Total Letters Mailed **633**

**April 2010 Intervention
Diabetes**

Cycle Comparison

Criteria Number	Unique Beneficiaries Received Letters	Unique Beneficiaries Intersecting with December 2010 ICER	Percent of Beneficiaries with Therapy Changes
41	57	30	47.4%
450	55	10	81.8%
488	114	59	48.2%
622	4	0	100.0%
635	9	1	88.9%
1040	3	0	100.0%
1045	7	0	100.0%
1047	1	1	0.0%
1053	13	4	69.2%
1054	114	10	91.2%
1056	6	0	100.0%
1060	17	9	47.1%
1143	1	0	100.0%
1145	2	0	100.0%
1308	50	1	98.0%
1602	17	1	94.1%
1674	7	1	85.7%
2356	3	2	33.3%
2573	59	25	57.6%
2934	37	13	64.9%
2947	1	0	100.0%
3045	4	1	75.0%
3047	1	0	100.0%
3048	2	0	100.0%
3150	1	0	100.0%
3224	13	5	61.5%
Totals	598	173	71.1%

April 2010 Intervention Diabetes

Estimated Cost Savings Summary

REPORT PARAMETERS

Pre-Intervention time period: 180
 Post-Intervention time period: 180
 Null period: 14
 Intervention Date: 4/19/2010

SUMMARY OF CASE INFORMATION

Total Number of Cases Generated: 693
 Total Number of Deleted Cases: 95
 Total Number of Letters Sent: 633
 Total Number of Completed Cases: 598
 Total Number of Unique Patients: 693
 Total Number of Patients with Completed Cases: 598
 Total Number of Patients Available for Analysis: 413

PATIENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

	# of Beneficiaries	Pre Intervention	Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Group 1	399	\$1,554,456	\$1,524,814	\$29,642	1.9%
Group 2	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Group 3	14	\$45,856	\$0	\$45,856	100%
Group 4	95	\$276,992	\$247,454	\$29,538	10.7%
Group 5	185	\$479,671	\$505,327	(\$25,655)	-5.3%

	Comparison Pre Intervention	Comparison Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Comparison Group 1	\$1,253,307	\$1,256,909	(\$3,603)	-0.3%

Estimated Cost Savings: \$33,245

KEY TO PATIENT ANALYSIS GROUPS

Group 1 – Patients with completed cases, data is available for both pre & post intervention timeframes.

Group 2 – Incomplete cases

Group 3 – Patients with complete cases but no data available for the post intervention timeframe, patient deceased or lost eligibility after letters were mailed.

Group 4 – Patients with letters deleted during the quality analysis.

Group 5 – Patients with completed cases where there would be an expected cost increase post-intervention.

June 2010 Intervention Dyslipidemia

Criteria Summary Case Outcomes

Criteria Number	Therapeutic Criteria Exceptions Reviewed	Cases Generated	Letters Generated	Letters Mailed
449	64	53	70	53
547	158	122	122	104
619	49	17	28	25
803	141	32	35	30
899	4	1	1	1
900	166	52	61	57
903	16	1	2	2
914	6	4	4	4
921	2	2	4	2
1011	118	108	108	91
1202	100	88	108	91
1204	8	7	8	7
1252	6	6	9	9
1278	2	1	2	2
1606	16	1	1	0
1624	4	4	4	3
3912	16	14	19	18
Totals	876	513	586	499

Case Response Totals

Prescriber Response	Count
Benefits of the drug outweigh the risks	10
Pt is no longer under this MD's care	8
MD says problem is insignificant, no therapy change	53
MD will reassess and modify drug therapy	19
MD tried to modify therapy, Pt non-cooperative	2
Pt under my care but not seen recently	1
Patient deceased	1
Patient was never under MD care	4
Has appointment to discuss therapy	14
MD did not write prescription attributed to him	8
MD saw patient only once in ER or as on-call MD	2
MD response form returned blank	13
Totals	135

Prescriber Response Rate: 27.1%

**June 2010 Intervention
Dyslipidemia**

Prescriber Evaluation Totals Report

Prescriber Evaluation	Count	Percent of Responses	Percent of Total Letters Mailed
Not useful	14	13.6%	2.8%
Somewhat useful	5	4.9%	1.0%
Neutral	28	27.2%	5.6%
Useful	32	31.1%	6.4%
Extremely useful	24	23.3%	4.8%
Total Responses	103		20.6%
Total Letters Mailed	499		

June 2010 Intervention Dyslipidemia

Estimated Cost Savings Summary

REPORT PARAMETERS

Pre-Intervention time period: 120
 Post-Intervention time period: 120
 Null period: 14
 Intervention Range: 6/8/2010

SUMMARY OF CASE INFORMATION

Total Number of Cases Generated: 513
 Total Number of Deleted Cases: 66
 Total Number of Letters Sent: 499
 Total Number of Completed Cases: 447
 Total Number of Unique Patients: 513
 Total Number of Patients with Completed Cases: 447
 Total Number of Patients Available for Analysis: 343

PATIENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

	# of Beneficiaries	Pre Intervention	Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Group 1	319	\$849,412	\$800,772	\$48,640	5.7%
Group 2	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
Group 3	24	\$45,758	\$0	\$45,758	100%
Group 4	66	\$143,391	\$136,377	\$7,014	4.9%
Group 5	104	\$247,869	\$224,191	\$23,678	9.6%
		Comparison Pre Intervention	Comparison Post Intervention	Difference	% Change
Comparison Group 1		\$720,905	\$681,397	\$39,509	5.5%

Estimated Cost Savings: \$9,131

KEY TO PATIENT ANALYSIS GROUPS

Group 1 – Patients with completed cases, data is available for both pre & post intervention timeframes.

Group 2 – Incomplete cases

Group 3 – Patients with complete cases but no data available for the post intervention timeframe, patient deceased or lost eligibility after letters were mailed.

Group 4 – Patients with letters deleted during the quality analysis.

Group 5 – Patients with completed cases where there would be an expected cost increase post-intervention.